

In the Drawings

Please revise the drawings in accordance with Request for Approval of Drawing Corrections attached hereto. The attached replacement sheet include changes to FIG. 1.

Replacement sheet 1, which includes FIG. 1, replaces the original sheet 1 including FIG.

1. In FIG. 1, reference numbers 41 (i.e., fastening devices) have been changed to reference numbers 44 (i.e., latching devices) to reflect the description in the specification (see description of FIG. 1). Additionally, two additional reference numbers 42 have been added to reflect the description in the specification on page 7, lines 19 and 20. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the disclosure. In response, Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to claims 16-20, 24, 45-49 and 53 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. In response, Applicant has amended claims 16, 17, 19, 24, 45, 46, 48, and 53 to include all of the limitations of the base claims and the intervening claims and therefore Applicant respectfully believes that claims 16, 17, 19, 24, 45, 46, 48, and 53 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-8, 10-14, and 21-23 depend from claim 16, claim 18 depends from claim 17, claim 20 depends from claim 19, claims 25-29 depend from claim 24, claims 31-37, 39-43, 50-52, and 54-61 depend from claim 45, claim 47 depends from claim 46, and claim 49 depends from claim 48, Applicant contends likewise that claims 2-8, 10-14, 18, 20-23, 25-29, 31-37, 39-43, 47, 49-52, and 54-61 are likewise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Randolph (US Pat. No. 5,616,111) in view of Chavin *et al.* (US Pat. No. 1,973,945).

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable

over Randolph in view of Chavin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tholkes (US Pat. No. 6,440,046).

The Examiner rejected claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Randolph in view of Chavin *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Abdo (US Pat. No. 6,022,303).

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chavin *et al.* in view of Randolph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Randolph in view of Chavin *et al.*

Applicants respectfully traverses the §112 with the following argument.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner alleges that “ The term 'resilient' is not supported by the specification or the drawings to uphold its intended meaning. The specification fails to disclose members 31, 32, 38, 39, 89, 90, 101, 153 and 174 as being resilient so as one of ordinary skill in the art would expect”.

In reponse, Applicant contends that the rejection of claim 1 is moot because claim 1 has been canceled. Additionally, all of the remaining claims that comprise the term 'resilient' have been amended to remove the term 'resilient'.



CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 19-0513.

Date: _____

12/15/05

Mark J. Friedman

Registration No.: 57,918

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850